

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, and 23-38 In view of the amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's thoughtful reconsideration.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102: The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, and 23-38 under §102(e) as being unpatentable over US Pub. 2002/0138558 to Ferlitsh.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for providing queue management and production device status in a distributed environment and, as amended, recites the following acts:

1. placing production data received from a client in a queue, the production data including production options for a target document identified by the client;
2. generating a queue interface having user accessible controls for managing production data held in the queue, the production data to be delivered to one of a plurality of production devices;
3. presenting the queue interface to the client;
4. generating a status interface for a chosen production device selected through the queue interface; and
5. presenting the status interface to the client.

Claim 1 includes one or more acts not taught by Ferlitsh. In short Claim 1 recites presenting a queue interface, generating a status interface for a chosen production device selected through the queue interface, and then presenting the status interface. Ferlitsh does not teach or suggest this.

The Examiner mistakenly contends that Ferlitsh, paragraph [0027] teaches the acts of generating a status interface for a chosen production device selected

through the queue interface; and presenting the status interface to the client. That paragraph is reproduced as follows:

[0027] Management of print jobs includes initiating and/or receiving a broadcast that is transmitted across the network. The broadcast may be used for a variety of management purposes, including to register a client in a distributed management of print jobs, to indicate an intent to despool a print job, to set or check the status of a despoiled print job, to set or get the status of a particular printing device, to request print queue information, and/or to request a print queue change, as will be further discussed below.

Ferlitsh, paragraph [0027].

The management of print jobs referred to in this paragraph is a task performed by a client. The paragraph indicates that a management task can include getting "the status of a particular printing device." Claim 1 recites more than just getting the status of a printing device. Claim 1 recites "generating a status interface for a chosen production device selected through the queue interface" (emphasis added). While Ferlitsh mentions getting the status of a particular printing device, Ferlitsh does not indicate or suggest that it "particular printing device" is selected through a queue interface in the manner recited in Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Ferlitsh as are Claims 2-3 and 5-7 which depend from Claim 1.

Claim 8 like Claim 1 recites presenting a queue interface, generating a status interface for a production device selected through the queue interface, and then presenting the status interface. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 8 and Claims 9 and 11-13 which depend from Claim 8. Claim 10 has been cancelled.

Claim 14 is directed to a computer program product for providing queue management and production device status in a distributed environment. The product includes a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 14 and Claims 15 and 17-19 which depend from Claim 14.

Claim 20 is directed to a computer program product for mediating access to production devices. The product includes a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions for implementing the method of Claim 8. For at least the same reasons Claim 8 is patentable, so are Claim 20 and Claims 21 and 23-25 which depend from Claim 20. Claim 22 was cancelled.

Claim 26 is directed to a system for providing queue management and production device status and recites elements for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 26 and Claims 27-31 which depend from Claim 26.

Claim 32 is directed to a system for providing queue management and production device status and recites the following elements for implementing the method of Claim 8. For at least the same reasons Claim 8 is patentable, so are Claim 32 and Claims 33-38 which depend from Claim 32.

CONCLUSION: The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Shell Sterling Simpson, et al.

By 

Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

May 22, 2006